DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 841 CS 507 622

AUTHOR Mason, Gail; Hogg, Mary
TITLE Oral Communication Across the Curriculum: A Report of Data.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association (Chicago, IL, April 11-14, 1991). Portions of materials in the appendixes may not be completely legible.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Apprehension; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Program Attitudes; Program Design; School Surveys; *Speech Communication; *Speech Instruction; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Eastern Illinois University; *Speaking across the Curriculum; Student Surveys

ABSTRACT

The goal of the Speaking Across the Curriculum movement is to increase oral communication competencies at the college and university level. Much of what has been implemented within Writing Across the Curriculum can be applied to Speaking Across the Curriculum. A study examined students' opinions of a proposed Speaking Center at Eastern Illinois University. Subjects, 1,000 students representing a stratified sample, responded to a 36-item questionnaire designed to answer the following questions: Are students in favor of the Speaking Center concept? How should the Speaking Center be designed? Results indicated that: (1) students believed oral communication experiences were beneficial to their learning in the classroom and that more courses outside the speech communication discipline should have some oral presentation component; (2) students thought that having a Speaking Center available for students in all academic departments was a good idea; (3) students would use the Speaking Center on a voluntary basis; (4) staffing of the Speaking Center was not of concern to the students; (5) much of the Speaking Center's focus should be on speech anxiety and class presentations; and (6) students exhibited a strong preference for one-on-one help. Findings favor the continued pursuit of the proposed Speaking Center project. (Two appendixes of data are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337841

Oral Communication Across the Curriculum: A Report of Data

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gail Mason

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS507622

A paper presented by Gail Mason and Mary Hogg at the Central States Communication Association convention, Chicago, 1991.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

In the 1990's, it is becoming ever-pressing and necessary to educate the young people of America in the communication skills of writing, reading, speaking, and listening. Along with general science, humanities, and social science courses, most universities specify that all students must complete English and speech courses in order to possess proficient communication skills. However, business and education leaders nationwide have noted recently that "college graduates do not possess adequate communication skills" (Cronin and Grice, 1990, p. 16).

Public school districts across the country, as well as colleges and universities have begun to reinforce their efforts to increase oral and written competencies. With writing projects come increased levels of reading projects as well. Personal writing and reading workshops have taken the nation by storm.

In an effort to enhance students' written communication skills at universities across the country, Writing Across the Curriculum programs are being widely implemented. In addition to requiring a writing component within core curriculum courses, all instructors, regardless of discipline, are encouraged to include some writing as graded activities within each course.

Depending on each university's financial or resource commitment, Writing Across the Curriculum can include workshops for instructors to expose them to methods for developing and evaluating writing activities, writing centers for students and faculty needing tutoring or advice, and a competency test for all students graduating from the university. These programs are no longer in the infancy stage but have been nurtured and are becoming stable curriculum components.

In the speech communication discipline, however, we are far behind our English counterparts. Little has been done in this area to date. In fact, McKiernan (1990) writes that we have not assessed systematically communication requirements, expectations, and instructional methods of courses within the university. In College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, Boyer (1987) notes that "the foundation for a successful undergraduate experience is proficiency in the written and the spoken word" (p. 73). Writing Across the Curriculum certainly identifies one aspect of the "successful undergraduate experience" but it does not address the issue of oral communication competency.

Boyer also reminds us that we speak more than we write. "Throughout our lives we judge others, and we ourselves are judged, by what we say and how we speak. The information age raises to new levels of urgency the need for all students to be proficient in the use of the spoken as well as the written word" (p. 81). The purpose of this paper is twofold. The first purpose is to provide a justification for a Speaking Across the Curriculum program. The second purpose is to explain the procedure and results of an investigation conducted at Eastern Illinois University that focuses on students' opinions of a proposed Speaking Center. Also, conclusions and implications for future research in this area will be presented.

Literature Review

As suggested above, the need exists to develop students' competencies in the communication skills of speaking, reading, writing, and listening. As a result of the current Writing Across the Curriculum movement, reading and writing skills are being emphasized. On the other hand, the only forum at most universities for developing speaking and listening skills is found in the

required basic speech course.

Because the Writing Across the Curriculum movement has proven effective, parallels can be drawn to the very recent Speaking Across the Curriculum movement. Bizzell and Herzberg (1986) state that Harvey Wiener, president of the Council of Writing Program Administrators, estimates that there are now about four hundred college-level writing across the curriculum programs. By comparison, according to Cronin and Grice (1990), there are few college-level speaking across the curriculum programs (p. 15).

In addition to the quantitative success of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement, there is much qualitative success as well. The strength of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement lies in the basic notion that students learn to write by writing--through practice, feedback, and response (Moffett, 1983, p. 188). Each of these three areas will be addressed, and their relationship to speaking across the curriculum will be presented.

Student practice in writing involves teachers in all disciplines using a variety of writing assignments in their courses. Teachers in these courses are not necessarily concerned with correcting students' grammatical errors as they are with the process-oriented approach itself. Fulweiler (1981) states that most teachers in disciplines other than English understand well that writing, like reading and mathematics, cannot be the sole province of teachers in any one discipline (p. 55).

Successful practice of this writing approach is demonstrated best when instructors have been through a series of workshops on the teaching of writing. At the Michigan Technological University, five workshops are designed to introduce content-area teachers to the theory and practice of writing across the curriculum. Workshops include the following topics:

exploring, journal writing, ideas and theories of James Britton, understanding expressive writing, responding to writing, and composing (Fulweiler, 1981).

Fulweiler (1981) asks the inevitable question, "How do you influence your colleagues to pay more attention to student writing?" His answer to this question is, "Ask them to write, to examine what they do when they write, and to share their insights with each other. After all, that's really what a writing workshop is--a time and a place for sharing among teachers who care" (p. 63). It seems that speech communication faculty could easily conduct similar workshops for their colleagues in other academic disciplines.

Radford University was awarded a grant to develop an Oral Communication program. According to Cronin and Grice (1990), the primary mission of the Oral Communication Program is twofold: (1) To provide programming, facilities and professional expertise to help faculty, staff and students improve oral communication skills, and (2) To support and facilitate the incorporation of oral communication into the undergraduate curriculum throughout Radford University, using the Writing Across the Curriculum program as a model (p. 1).

Cronin and Grice (1990) also noted that students involved with the Oral Communication Program at Radford University have "recognized the need for upgrading their communication skills and have responded enthusiastically to the activities encouraged by the Oral Communication Program" (p. 14). This program has received favorable review by administrators who provided the financial resources, and faculty, who "appreciate the assistance available and have been eager to make use of it" (p. 14).

After students practice writing, feedback and response are the next logical steps in enhancing students' writing competencies. According to Moffett (1983), feedback is any information a learner receives as a result of his/her

trial. He compares this to the coaching situation: "This is where the coach comes in. He/she is someone who observes the learner's actions and the results, and points out what the learner cannot see for himself/herself. He/she is a human source of feedback who supplements the feedback from inanimate things" (p. 189).

Feedback in the writing across the curriculum movement is designed to be supportive as well as suggestive. Kirby and Liner (1981) offer advice to teachers of writing advice as part of the feedback process. They note that the first job is to build confidence, and that teachers need to "teach them that they don't have to be afraid of writing--a task not really as difficult as it may first appear" (p. 32).

If success has been found through feedback via proven strategies in the Writing Across the Curriculum movement, it would follow that the speech communication discipline could adopt a similar technique. For example, when critiquing speeches, instructors could offer strengths of student speeches as well as suggestions for improvement. This would be in lieu of using the terminology "positive" and "negative" for categorizing responses. Another possibility is to provide an atmosphere where students can express themselves, build their confidence, and reduce their anxiety. In the Writing Across the Curriculum program, teachers are encouraged to write with their students during class. Similarly, faculty in the speech communication discipline could "speak" with their students.

The third element to improving written competencies involves eliciting responses from peers. Elbow (1986) notes two types of responses; subjective and objective. Subjective responses are those which give the facts of what actually occurred in the observer or reader; those perceptions or reactions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

which underlie judgments, conclusions, or advice (p. 207). Objective responses can be grouped into three main categories: adding control or steering the student or peer, adding presence (energy, safety, support), and/or adding perceptions and information (p. 211).

Eliciting peer response is also relevant to the speech communication discipline. However, no particular strategy currently exists to integrate responding and critiquing into regular classroom procedure. It would make sense, however, to form peer response groups within classes and have each group be responsible for hearing peer speeches within that group at some point before the final product is presented in front of the whole class.

To a large extent, the speech communication discipline already incorporates into its courses the previously discussed areas of practice, feedback, and response. However, these concepts are not "across the curriculum" at this point. As with writing, the universities need to acknowledge the fact that students need help with reducing their speech anxiety, organizing the content of their speeches, outlining, and delivery skills. Given the increased class size and load demand on faculty, it is not easy to work with students on a one-to-one basis. In many cases, students are hesitant to seek their professor's help outside the classroom.

A campus-wide speaking center could benefit the students and faculty at any university where the desire to increase oral communication proficiencies exists. Students would have the opportunity to practice speaking in front of peer tutors, graduate assistants, and professional staff members. Equipment and technology would be available so students could videotape their performances and critique themselves before performing in class. Within a non-threatening environment, students would also receive feedback and

responses from the Speaking Center staff. Peer groups could be formed to support the particularly apprehensive student.

Faculty could also benefit from the services of the Speaking Center in the areas of practice, feedback, and response. Through workshops, they could be provided with strategies for incorporating oral communication activities into their courses. Staff members could visit classes of faculty members requesting assistance on presentational style or the implementation of an oral communication activity.

The goal of the Writing Across the Curriculum movement is to increase students' written communication competencies. The goal of the Speaking Across the Curriculum movement is to increase oral communication competencies. Research suggests that both writing and oral competencies need to be stressed more at the college and university level. Much of what has been implemented within Writing Across the Curriculum can be applied to Speaking Across the Curriculum. As the one movement provides a Writing Center for students, our proposal is to provide a Speaking Center.

The following section details an initial investigation that was designed to determine the interest in and design possibilities for a Speaking Center at Eastern Illinois University. The investigation's procedure, results, statistical analyses as well as concluding observations are reported.

Method

At the present, the Department of Speech Communication at Eastern Illinois University has proposed a Speaking Center for the university that would allow students to receive help on oral communication projects. Other than equipment needs (video and audio), the proposal does not specify how the Center would be

configured. At least initially, however, providing assistance to students with many speech-related activities will be the primary focus. The previous section provided rationale for both the Speaking Across the Curriculum and a Speaking Center. Since providing students with the opportunity to enhance their oral communication skills is the primary reason for establishing a Speaking Center, it makes sense to elicit their feedback.

Questionnaire

A 36-item questionnaire was compiled to answer the following primary questions: (1) Are students in favor of the Speaking Center concept? and (2) How should the Speaking Center be designed? Answers to these concerns should indicate the utility of a Speaking Center and provide suggestions for its development. Of the 36-items, 17 were five-point Likert-type scale items where the scale ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Twelve items were constructed for bipolar answers (yes-no), and seven items required students to choose four or five alternatives. Students noted their responses on computerized sheets that were then scanned. Raw data, a raw data summary, and mean and median scores were provided to the investigators.

The questionnaire was designed to address the two above-mentioned primary concerns. However, additional information was requested in an effort to find out more about the subjects' backgrounds and exposure to oral communication activities. Demographic questions asking the respondent's major, year in school, and amount of course work completed in Speech Communication were useful for determining, to some extent, the degree of exposure students have had to oral communication activities. Also, the student's major and year in school might have some influence on how he/she perceives the benefit of the

Speaking Center.

Questions related to communication apprehension and communication competence were asked because of the possibility that students with higher levels of communication apprehension might perceive the Speaking Center as more beneficial than students with lower levels of communication apprehension. Also, students with lower communication competency scores might perceive the Speaking Center as more beneficial than students with higher communication competency scores. The statistical mean for five questions, developed by Spielberger, et al. (1970) was used to determine communication apprehension. The statistical mean for six questions, taken from Rubin's (1985) Communication Competency Assessment Instrument was used to determine the mean level of communication competence.

An additional six five-point Likert-type scale questions were asked to determine the respondent's overall impression of the proposed Speaking Center and learning preference (video-tape, audio-tape, written material or one-on-one). Five additional questions asked about staffing the Speaking Center, beneficial services the Speaking Center could provide, and most and least preferred learning style. Six bipolar questions were asked to determine student perceptions of the utility of a Speaking Center. Finally, seven demographic questions asked for the student's major, year in school, and amount of exposure to communication courses.

Subjects

Out of a population of approximately 9000 students, 1000 were solicited through campus mail and through classroom visitations by two research assistants. The mailed questionnaire was sent to on-campus students only. Hence, these respondents lived in residence halls and were mostly freshmen and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sophomores. All subjects were provided with a brief description of what the Speaking Center proposes to accomplish. Once responses to the mailing were received, attempts were made to solicit students so that a stratified sample could be gathered. Questionnaires were collected over a three-week period, and an ongoing tally was kept so that specific classes could be targeted. In all cases, participation in this investigation was voluntary.

Research assistants visited classrooms ranging from freshman to senior level designations and representing a variety of disciplines (sociology, psychology, business, economics, speech communication). More freshmen were polled than sophomores; more sophomores than juniors; more juniors than seniors. Given that the investigators were interested in comparing Speech majors' responses with responses from other disciplines, approximately one-fourth of the subjects were Speech majors. The other respondents were categorized according to the following majors: business, education, undeclared, or "other." Approximately one-fourth of the subjects were Business majors, approximately 15 percent were Education majors, and the remaining were either undeclared or "other."

Based on the questionnaire results, in addition to knowing the respondent's major and year in school, the investigators were also able to determine how many speech courses respondents have completed or are currently taking. Sixty-six percent of the subjects had at least one speech course in high school. Seventy-percent have taken or are currently enrolled in the basic speech course at EIU, SPC 1310. Only 339 have completed three to six hours in speech courses other than SPC 1310; 199 of these were speech majors. Similarly, 228 respondents reported having completed nine or more hours in speech courses other than the basic one; 179 of these were speech majors. When asked to

respond to the statement, "I plan to take additional Speech Communication courses as electives," 298 indicated "Yes." Of these, 128 were Speech majors. These results demonstrate that many students have had courses that specifically involve oral communication activities, and over one-fourth are planning to take additional courses which involve such activities.

Given that the focus of the Speaking Center is to help with Speaking Across the Curriculum, we want to recognize that oral communication activities are not solely the province of Speech Communication. In this investigation, students were asked to respond to the statement, "I have had courses outside Speech Communication that involved some speaking component such as a speech, presentation, or role-play." Approximately 70% of the respondents answered in the affirmative. Hence, oral communication activities are found in courses outside the speech communication discipline.

Results

Results of this questionnaire clearly indicate a preference for the Speaking Center. Results also show that students have preferred methods for learning, and no particular preference for who staffs the Speaking Center. A summary of the raw data for the entire sample (1000 subjects) is found in Appendix A. A mean or percentage comparison of the total sample with Speech Communication majors and non-Speech Communication majors is presented in Appendix B. Results will be discussed in order of questions outlined in the method section.

Are students in favor of the Speaking Center concept?

One item was designed to answer this question specifically, and three items

were developed to assess the respondent's perception about oral communication activities, in general. The first item was the statement, "Having a Speaking Center available for students in all academic departments is a good idea." Over 80% of the respondents said, "Yes."

The second item related to how students perceive oral presentations. Students were asked to indicate why oral presentations (outside of speech communication) are not beneficial. The negative answers included the following: "faculty members do not explain the assignments clearly," "too much of the course grade depends on these assignments," and "I am afraid to speak in front of groups." The last option stated, "None of the above." Oral presentations are beneficial." Close to 50 percent of the respondents chose the last option. Approximately 15 percent chose the second, third, and fourth options. Only 83 of the 1000 subjects indicated that, "Faculty members do not explain these assignments clearly."

Two items concerning oral communication activities were constructed so that students could place their responses on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree). The mean for the statement, "As a student, I find having some oral communication experience beneficial to my learning in the classroom" was 1.5, which falls between "strongly agree" and "agree." Out of the 1000 respondents, 633 noted "strongly agree." For the statement, "I think more courses (other than speech communication) should have some oral presentation component" the mean was 2.3, which falls between "agree" and "neutral."

In addition to determining whether or not students favor the Speaking Center, it is important to discover if they would use it. Five bipolar questions were designed to discover whether or not students would use the

Speaking Center, and under what conditions students would use its services. Responding to the statement, "I might consider using the services available through the Speaking Center," only 15% of the respondents said, "No." Over 85 percent of the respondents said, "No" to the statement, "The Speaking Center should be available to Speech Communication students only." Ninety-four percent of the students noted that the Speaking Center should be free of charge, and 85 percent stated that students would use the Speaking Center on a voluntary basis. In responding to a related statement, only 186 of the 1000 students indicated "yes" to the statement, "Students would use the Speaking Center only if it were part of the course requirement."

How should the Speaking Center be designed?

Given that students agree that the Speaking Center would be beneficial and that students would use its services, and assuming that funding is found for the Speaking Center, design issues must be addressed. The questionnaire addressed the following issues: (1) Which services would be most beneficial? (2) What learning methods are most preferred? and (3) Who should staff the Speaking Center?

One item asked students to identify which service offered by the proposed Speaking Center would most benefit students. Possible responses and the percentage of students indicating each are as follows: topic development (12.2%), outlining (9.3%), class presentations/speeches (34.6%), presentation format (11.6%), and speech anxiety (33%). The results show that class presentations and speech anxiety are the two major concerns students have concerning oral communication activities.

This investigation examined four learning methods: written materials, audio-tapes, video-tapes, and one-on-one. Although all methods will be available for students, decisions will be made as to how much money should be allocated for what resources. Student learning preference is important to know for resource acquisition as well as for design of the Speaking Center.

Six items were developed to assess student learning preferences. Four statements asked students to note their degree of interest in each of the learning preferences. For example, students were asked to respond, on a five-point Likert-type scale (strongly agree-strongly disagree) to the following statement, "If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in watching videotapes relating to the area with which I sought help." The only learning preference which received a mean score between "strongly agree" and "agree" was one-on-one (mean = 1.6). The other learning method preferences, according to the mean scores were videotapes (2.1), written material (2.4), and audiotapes (2.5). No learning preference fell outside the range of "agree" to "neutral."

Two items were developed to assess students' most preferred and least preferred learning method. Overwhelmingly, the most preferred learning method was "one-to-one basis." Seventy-six percent of those responding chose this preference. Percentages for the other preferences are as follows: videotapes (13.3%), written material (5.8%), and audiotapes (3.5%). When indicating their least preferred learning method, students clearly indicated two learning methods; written material (45.7%) and audiotapes (42.5%). Only 6.5 % of the respondents chose videotapes as their least preferred method, and 4.2% chose one-to-one.

Staffing decisions will be important because the Speaking Center needs to

provide a professional yet comfortable atmosphere for students so they will utilize its services. Possible staff include peer tutors, graduate students, and/or faculty. Students were asked, "Who would you feel most comfortable with having as a tutor?" No clear preference was indicated. In fact, results show that over one third of the respondents noted "no preference" (38.2%). Those who indicated a preference generally chose either faculty (23.6%) or graduate students (22.5%). Only 137 out of 1000 students indicated that they would be most comfortable with a peer tutor.

Communication Apprehension and Communication Competency Comparisons

Although the primary interests in this investigation were to determine whether or not students are in favor of a Speaking Center and to gather feedback concerning the design of the Speaking Center, we were also interested in how the students perceived their levels of communication apprehension and communication competence. It was thought that their responses relating to the Speaking Center might be influenced by their perceived level of apprehension and communication competency. Someone who perceives him/herself to be communicatively apprehensive might find the Speaking Center to be beneficial whereas someone with a lower level of communication apprehension might not find it beneficial. The same would be true concerning communication competence. Also, it was thought that Speech Communication majors would have a lower communication apprehension score than all other majors.

T-tests were computed to test the difference in mean scores between Speech Communication majors and all other majors. A significant difference was found when comparing the mean communication apprehension score of Speech Communication majors with all other majors ($t = 9.78$; $p > .01$). Speech

Communication majors perceived themselves to be less apprehensive than other majors. The mean score for Speech Communication majors was 2.89 and for other majors, the mean score was 3.62. These scores are on a five-point scale, ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5). Two of the five communication apprehension items were stated in the negative but were recoded for the statistical analysis.

The statistical analysis also indicated that Speech Communication majors perceived themselves to be more communicatively competent than other majors ($t = 5.29$; $p > .01$). The mean score for Speech Communication majors on the communication competency scale was 2.18; for other majors, the mean score was 2.40.

Additional t-tests were computed to compare the mean communication apprehension scores of the speech majors who said "yes" to the statement, "Having a Speaking Center is a good idea" with those who said "no." Analyses were also conducted comparing other majors who indicated "yes" with those who reported, "no." A significant difference was found between speech majors responding in the affirmative and those responding in the negative ($t = 2.13$; $p > .04$). However, the communication apprehension scores of those reporting that the Speaking Center would <u>not</u> be beneficial were <u>higher</u> than those who reported that it would be beneficial.

On the other hand, the difference between means of the other speech majors who reported that the Speaking Center would be beneficial and those who said it wouldn't be beneficial was also statistically significant, and the communication apprehension scores of those reporting in the affirmative were higher than those who perceived no benefit ($t = 3.09$; $p > .01$). For those reporting "yes," their mean score was 3.68; for those reporting "no," the mean

score was 3.37. It should also be noted that the mean communication apprehension score of the Speech Communication majors who noted that having a Speaking Center is a good idea was lower than the mean score for the other majors who responded favorably (Speech Communication mean = 2.83; other majors mean = 3.68)

Other Comparisons between Speech Communication Majors and Other Majors

Speech communication majors and other majors were also compared on the following items: (1) As a student, I find having some oral communication experience beneficial to my learning in the classroom, (2) I think more courses (other than Speech Communication) should have some oral presentation component, (3) If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in watching videotapes relating to the area with which I sought help, (4) If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in listening to audiotapes relating to the area with which I sought help, (5) If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in reading written material relating to the area with which I sought help, and (6) If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in working with the staff at the Speaking Center on a one-to-one basis.

All items revealed a statistical difference when comparing the mean score for Speech Communication majors with the mean score from other majors. In all cases, Speech Communication majors had a lower mean score. All analyses were significant at the $p > .01$ level or lower. Given that the Speech Communication majors have chosen a discipline that involves oral communication activities, it would make sense that they would find oral communication experiences beneficial (mean score for Speech Communication majors = 1.28;

other majors = 1.63). Also, it is logical to assume that they would strongly agree that more courses should have some oral presentation component (mean score for Speech Communication majors = 1.57; other majors = 2.5). Even though both items revealed a significant difference, as one can see by the mean scores, there was as greater disparity in scores regarding the notion of having other courses include some oral component.

Four items related to learning preference. Again, there was a significant difference between the scores of Speech Communication majors and the scores of other majors. In each case, the particular learning method was rated more highly by Speech Communication majors than by other majors. In all cases, however, the mean difference was never greater than .4. The preference order was also the same; Speech Communication majors and other majors find one-to-one learning most preferred and listening to audiotapes least preferred.

Conclusion

This investigation showed that students find oral communication experiences beneficial to their learning in the classroom. They also agreed that more courses outside the speech communication discipline should have some oral presentation component. Additionally, students think that having a Speaking Center available for students in all academic departments is a good idea. Results indicated that students would use the facilities on a voluntary basis; not just as a course requirement. In other words, students do perceive the Speaking Center favorably. Results investigation support developing a Speaking Center on campus.

Although this investigation's primary concern involved testing students' reactions to a proposed Speaking Center, the secondary concern related to

design features. Several design-related conclusions can be drawn. First, results of this questionnaire suggest that staffing is not students' major concern. Although subjects preferred graduate students and faculty over peer tutors, many subjects indicated no preference. There was no clear indication that the Speaking Center should be staffed by faculty; this may be cost-effective in the long run.

Second, results suggest that much of the Speaking Center's focus needs to be on speech anxiety and class presentations. Students noted speech anxiety and class presentations or speeches as the services they think will most benefit students. Not only is this information helpful in terms of developing the Center, but it is necessary information for resource allocation. The Center needs equipment to videotape students who are working to reduce their speech anxiety and/or trying to enhance their presentational skills.

Third, this investigation revealed student's strong preference for one-on-one help. Given the overwhelming agreement that one-on-one help is the most preferred learning method, when developing the Speaking Center, resources need to be allocated for sufficient staff. While students indicated that they would use other learning methods such as watching videotapes, listening to audiotapes, and reading material on their area of concern, at least initially, compiling these resources is not essential.

Earlier in this paper the authors demonstrated the need for developing oral communication competencies. We also noted the similarities between Writing Across the Curriculum and Speaking Across the Curriculum. Given that writing centers are frequently part of the program to improve written competencies, we noted that having a speaking center would aid students working to improve their oral competencies. This investigation revealed that students from a

variety of disciplines see the benefit to such a center and would consider using its facilities. Results also provided us with feedback concerning how the Speaking Center might be configured. Further research could delve into students' perceived needs in relationship to their oral communication competencies. However, results of this investigation are sufficiently strong to warrant continue to pursue this proposed project.

References

Bizzell, P. & Herzberg, B. (1986). Writing across the curriculum. A bibliographic essay. In D. McQuade (Ed.), The territory of language: Linguistics, stylistics, and the teaching of composition (2nd ed). Carbondale: SIU press.

Boyer, E. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Cronin, M. & Grice, G. (1990, November). Oral communication across the curriculum: Designing, implementing, and assessing a university-wide program. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago.

Elbow, P. (1986). Embracing contraries: Explorations in learning and teaching. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fulweiler, T. (1981). Showing, not telling, at a writing workshop. College English, 43.

Kirby, D. and Liner, T. (1981). Inside out: Developmental strategies for teaching writing. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

McKiernan, J. (1990, April). One university's communication expectations. Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association convention, Detroit.

Moffett, J. (1983). Teaching the universe of discourse. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Rubin, R. B. (1985). The validity of the communication competency assessment instrument. Communication Monographs, 52, 173-186.

Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., and Lushene, R. E. (1970). Manual for state-trait anxiety inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Summary of Raw Data

	*1	**2	***3	****4	*****5
I feel tense about giving an oral presentation.	245	393	86	215	56
I feel calm about giving an oral presentation.	69	225	136	412	152
I feel at ease about giving an oral presentation.	71	235	136	392	142
I feel relaxed about giving an oral presentation.	53	186	159	430	165
I feel jittery about giving an oral presentation.	215	432	104	181	60
When speaking with some one, the words I use say one thing while my face and tone of voice say something different.	28	125	209	456	180
When giving a speech, I speak clearly and distinctly.	122	514	215	127	17
When I give directions to another person, the directions are accurate.	170	635	119	67	6
When giving a speech, I thoroughly express and fully defend my positions on issues.	155	482	246	102	9
When I have to introduce myself in a class, I am able to fully and consisely describe my interests and let others know who I am.	161	452	160	206	17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

	*1	**2	***3	****4	*****5
I have to answer a question several times before others seem satisfied with my answers.	50	79	220	555	95

* Strongly Agree
** Agree
*** Undecided
**** Disagree
***** Strongly Disagree

	YES	NO
Having a Speaking Center available for students in all academic departments is a good idea.	823	150
The Speaking Center should available to Speech Communication students only.	96	855
Having a Speaking Center offered to students free of charge is a good idea.	937	45
Students would use the Speaking Center on a voluntary basis.	845	129
Students would use the Speaking Center only if it were part of the course requirement.	196	767
I might consider using the services available through the Speaking Center.	815	149

Appendix A

	*1	**2	***3	****4	*****5
As a student, I find having some oral communication experience is beneficial to my learning in the classroom.	633	232	78	35	12
I think more courses (other than SPC) should have some oral presentation component.	344	290	160	121	72
If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in watching videotapes relating to the area with which I sought help.	352	356	169	78	28
If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in listening to audiotapes relating to the area with which I sought help.	208	345	203	185	51
If I used the Speaking, I would be interested in reading written material relating to the area with which I sought help.	205	411	189	141	49
If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in working with the staff at the Speaking Center on a one-to-one basis.	573	321	71	25	5

* Strongly Agree
** Agree
*** Undecided
**** Disagree
***** Strongly Disagree

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix A

	A	B	C	D	E
Which service offered by the proposed Speaking Center do you think will most benefit students? A. Topic development B. outlining C. class presentations D. presentation format E. speech anxiety	122	61	346	116	330
Who would you feel <u>most</u> comfortable having as a tutor (check only one): A. peer/student B. graduate student C. faculty D. no preference	137	225	236	382	18
Which is your <u>most preferred</u> method for learning at the Speaking Center? A.videotapes B. audiotapes C. written material D. one-to-one basis	133	35	58	760	7
Which is your <u>least preferred</u> method for learning at the Speaking Center? A. videotapes B. audiotapes C. written material D. one-to-one basis	65	425	457	42	3
Oral presentations <u>outside of SPC</u> are not beneficial as course requirements because (choose the <u>one</u> item that most applies): A. faculty members do not explain these assignments clearly. B. Too much of the course grade depends on these assignments. C. I am afraid to speak in front of groups. D. The assignments seem irrelevant to class material. E. None of the above. Oral presentations are beneficial	83	154	151	137	463

Appendix A

	A	B	C	D
Year in school:	290	283	242	180

A. Freshman
B. Sophmore
C. Junior
D. Senior

	A	B	C	D	E
Major:	233	234	138	78	315

A. Speech Communication
B. Business
C. Education
D. Undeclared
E. Other

	YES	NO
I completed at least one speech course in high school.	661	322
I completed or am currently enrolled in SPC 1310.	696	294
I completed 3-6 hours in SPC courses <u>other</u> <u>than</u> SPC 1310.	539	641
I completed 9 or more hours in SPC courses other than SPC 1310.	228	759
I plan to take additional SPC courses as electives.	298	683
I have had courses outside Speech Communication that involved some speaking component such as speech, presentation, or role play.	690	297

Appendix B

QUESTIONS	MEAN SCORE		
Communication Apprehension	**All Respondents**	**Speech**	**Non Speech**
I feel tense about giving an oral presentation.	2.1	2.9	2.0
I feel calm about giving an oral presentation.	3.7	2.6	3.8
I feel at ease about giving an oral presentation.	3.6	2.5	3.7
I feel relaxed about giving an oral presentation.	3.7	2.9	3.9
I feel jittery about giving an oral presentation.	2.2	2.5	2.1
Communication Competence			
When speaking with someone, the words I use say one thing while my face and tone of voice say something different.	3.8	3.9	3.8
When giving a speech, I speak clearly and distinctly.	2.2	2.1	2.3
When I give directions to another person, the directions are accurate.	2.0	1.9	2.0
When giving a speech, I thoroughly express and fully defend my positions on issues.	2.2	2.0	2.3
When I have to introduce myself in a class, I am able to fully and consisely describe my interests and let others know who I am.	2.2	2.0	2.3

Appendix B

QUESTIONS	MEAN SCORE		
Communication Competence	**All Respondents**	**Speech**	**Non Speech**
I have to answer a question several times before others seem satisfied with my answer.	3.8	3.8	3.8
Demographics and opinions			
As a student, I find having some oral communication experience is beneficial to my learning in the classroom.	1.5	1.1	1.5
I think more courses (other than SPC) should have some oral presentation component.	2.0	1.3	2.3

	MEAN SCORE					
	All Respondents		**Speech**		**Non Speech**	
	yes	**no**	**yes**	**no**	**yes**	**no**
Having a Speaking Center available for students in all academic departments is a good idea.	82.3	15.0	81.5	15.4	82.5	14.9
The Speaking Center should be available to Speech Communication students only.	96	85.5	15.4	77.5	7.8	87.8
Having a Speaking Center offered to students free of charge is a good idea.	93.7	45	93	5.3	93.9	4.3
Students would use the Speaking Center on a voluntary basis.	84.5	12.9	79.7	17.2	85.9	11.6
Students would use the Speaking Center only if it were part of the course requirement.	18.6	76.7	22.0	72.7	17.6	77.9

APPENDIX B

Demographics and Opinions	MEAN SCORE					
	All Respondents		Speech		Non Speech	
	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
I might consider using the services available through the Speaking Center.	81.5	14.9	83.7	14.1	80.9	15.1
I completed at least one speech course in high school.	66.1	32.2	70.9	26.0	64.7	34.0
I completed or am currently enrolled in SPC 1310.	69.6	29.4	78	20.7	67.1	32.0
I completed 3-6 hours in SPC courses other than SPC 1310.	33.9	64.1	87.7	10.6	18.1	79.8
I completed 9 or more hours in SPC courses other than SPC 1310.	22.8	75.9	78.9	20.3	5.3	92.2
I plan to take additional SPC courses as electives.	29.8	68.3	56.4	40.5	2.0	76.5
I have had courses outside Speech Communication that involved some speaking component such as speech, presentation, or role play.	69.0	29.7	78.0	20.7	66.4	32.3

Learning Preference	MEAN SCORE		
	All Respondents	Speech	Non Speech
If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in watching videotapes relating to the area with which I sought help.	1.9	1.6	2.0
If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in listening to audiotapes relating to the area with which I sought help.	2.3	2.1	2.4

Learning Preference	MEAN SCORE All Respondents	Speech	Non Speech
If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in reading written material relating to the area with which I sought help.	2.2	1.9	2.3
If I used the Speaking Center, I would be interested in working with the staff at the Speaking Center on a one-to-one basis.	1.4	1.3	1.4

Learning Preference	MEAN SCORE A	B	C	D	E
Which service offered by the proposed Speaking Center do you think will most benefit students? A. Topic development B. outlining C. class presentations D. presentation format E. speech anxiety	12.2* 6.3** 11.0***	9.3 9.3 5.2	34.6 37.0 33.9	11.6 13.2 11.1	34.6 37.0 33.9
Who would you feel most comfortable having as a tutor (check only one): A. peer/student B. graduate student C. faculty D. no preference	37 14.1 13.6	22.5 24.2 22.0	23.6 27.8 22.4	38.2 30.8 40.4	
Which is your most preferred method for learning at the Speaking Center? A. videotapes B. audiotapes C. written material D. one-to-one basis	13.3 13.7 13.2	35 3.1 3.6	58 4.4 6.2	76.0 76.7 75.8	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	MEAN SCORE				
Learning Preference	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**
Which is your least preferred method for learning at the Speaking Center? A. videotapes B. audiotapes C. written material D. one-to-one basis	65 6.2 6.6	42.5 42.7 42.4	45.7 46.7 45.4	42 4.0 4.3	
Oral presentations outside of SPC are not beneficial as course requirements because (choose the one item that most applies): A. faculty members do not explain these assignments clearly. B. too much of the course grade depends on these assignments. C. I am afraid to speak in front of groups. D. The assignments seem irrelevant to class material. E. None of the above. Oral presentations are beneficial.	83 10.1 7.8	15.9 11.5 17.2	15.1 6.2 17.7	13.7 12.3 14.1	46.3 59.9 42.3

	A	B	C	D
Year in school: A. Freshman B. Sophmore C. Junior D. Senior	29.0* 6.2** 35.7***	28.3 20.7 30.5	24.2 35.2 21.0	18.0 37.4 12.3

	A	B	C	D	E
Major: A. Speech Communication B. Business C. Education D. Undeclared E. Other	23.3 22.7 ----	23.4 ---- 30.1	13.8 ---- 17.9	78 ---- 10.0	31.5 ---- 40.8

* Non respondents
** Speech
*** Non Speech